

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL HUFTILE,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-1522 FCD DAD P

vs.

L.C. MICCIO-FONSECA, Ph.D.,

Defendant.

ORDER

_____/

Plaintiff has requested a 120-day extension of time to file objections to the court's findings and recommendations, filed on December 8, 2006. Plaintiff contends that he does not have access to a computer and that the person's computer he was using was confiscated by staff at Coalinga State Hospital. Plaintiff states that he was working on a declaration in support of the complaint and that he had completed the "beginning stages" of his objections. The court will grant plaintiff a limited extension since the only pending deadline in this case is for the filing of objections. Plaintiff is also advised that the purpose of objections is merely to inform the assigned District Judge "of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made" so that a de novo review can be conducted. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's January 11, 2007 request for an extension of time is granted in part;
and

2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file his objections to the findings and recommendations filed on December 8, 2006. No further extensions of time for this purpose will be granted absent a showing of extraordinary circumstances justifying such an extension of time.

DATED: January 23, 2007.



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:bb/4
huft1522.36